

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOEL TOLBERT,
Plaintiff,
v.

ANTIOCH POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-02026-JSC](#)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 72

This is a civil rights action filed by a California prisoner proceeding without an attorney. Defendants are the Antioch Police Department (“APD”), APD Chief Allan Cantando, and APD Officers James Colley and James Perkinson. Now pending before the Court is Defendants’ second motion for a protective order. (ECF No. 72.) Plaintiff was ordered to show cause, on or before April 26, 2024, why the Court’s model “Stipulated Protective Order for Standard Litigation” (a copy of which was mailed to him) should not be entered. (ECF No. 74 at 2:18-20.) Plaintiff has not done so.¹ Accordingly, the motion for a protective order is GRANTED. The protective order is entered separately.

On April 29, 2024, the Court received Plaintiff’s “response” to Defendants’ opposition to Plaintiff’s motion for sanctions. (ECF No. 75.) Although the motion for sanctions was denied on April 11, 2024,² the Court has nevertheless reviewed Plaintiff’s “response” and concludes it does not change the Court’s ruling on the motion. Additionally, Plaintiff states he has not received all the discovery he requested. (*Id.* at 3:11; 75.1 at ¶ 10.) The Court will not act on any discovery dispute unless a party files a motion to compel that includes “a certification that the movant has in

¹ Plaintiff also did not notify the Court he agrees to the order, which he had the option to do. (ECF No. 74 at 2:18-20.)

² Plaintiff indicates the postal service initially returned his response to him as undeliverable, and he re-mailed it to the Court. (ECF No. 76 at 1.)

1 good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or
2 discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1). Defendants
3 are reminded they shall produce paper copies of any discovery documents (excluding video or
4 audio recordings) because Plaintiff cannot access electronic documents. (*See* ECF No. 69.)

5 This Order disposes of Docket No. 72.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: May 6, 2024

8
9
10 
11 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28